

## NOTES.

ON THE ADVENTURES OF THE GENUS NAME *LUCENA*. (Read 9th March, 1917).—In 1815 Oken (Lehrb. Naturg., iii, p. 312) created the superfluous name *Lucena* for Draparnaud's *Succinea*, giving as example *Lucena putris*.

In 1821 J. D. W. Hartmann applied the name to Draparnaud's *Helix naticoides* [= *H. aperta*], which he called *Lucena tapada* (Neue Alpina, i, pp. 202, 208, note, and 245 [as *L. tapada*], pl. i, f. 30 and 31), and put *L. putris, succinea*, etc., into *Amphibina* (his own corruption for *Amphibulina* of Lamarek). He inveighs against Férussac, who puts it with his *Cochloides* (Tabl. Syst. Limaçons, 1821, January ed., p. 30, June ed., p. 26), maintaining (Neue Alpina, i, p. 208, note, and again later in Sturm's Deutschl. Fauna, vi, lft. 5, pp. 27, 28) that its correct place was with Férussac's *Seminudæ*, next to *Daudebardia* [= *Helicophanta*, Fér.]. Here he places it in the "Verzeichniss" given in Sturm (vi, lft. 5, p. 54), and the species *tapada* not being German its place is taken by *Lucena pulchella*, described in a footnote as "n.sp."

This last *nomen nudum* caught the eye of J. E. Gray, who without further research, and oblivious of the fact that *Helix pulchella* was duly cited by Hartmann two pages further back, mistook it for a synonym of the latter, and accordingly so rendered it in his edition of Turton's Manual, 1840 (p. 142), tacking on to it a reference to Hartmann's "t. i, f. 6", which is for *Helix pulchella*, that for *Lucena* being f. 8. This erroneous citation was copied bodily by Dupuy (Hist. nat. Moll. France, p. 161, 1848). Moquin-Tandon also blindly accepted this synonymy (Hist. Moll. France, ii, 1855, p. 140), and seeing that the alleged Hartmann's *Lucena* (1821) had priority over Risso's *Vallonia* (1826) gave the former name to the section of *Helix*, which he established for Müller's *H. pulchella*. Pilsbry fortunately evaded this pitfall, and Hartmann's *Lucena tapada* appears correctly under *Helix aperta* (Man. Conch., ser. II, vol. ix, p. 316), whilst his *Lucena pulchella* is, properly, ignored.

B. B. WOODWARD.

NOTE ON THE DA COSTA PLATES ADAPTED FOR RACKETT'S EDITION OF PULTENEY'S CATALOGUES. (Read 9th March, 1917).—No further light has been shed on the former proprietorship of these plates since Mr. Reynell's description of them (Proc. Malac. Soc., xii, 1916, p. 43), but in going through Pulteney's 1799 edition with the Rackett second (1813) edition, it was noticed that a number of references to "Trit. Brit." in the former had all been omitted in the latter.

Turning to Pulteney's "Explanation of the abbreviated Names of Authors" on p. 24, the following consecutive entries are seen:—

"*Da Costa*. Da Costa, E. Mendez, British Conchology, French and English, with 17 Tables, Lond., 1778, 4to.

*Trit. Brit.* Triton Britannicus; a new Impression of the foregoing Plates, with Seven additional Tables. MS."

This last, then, is obviously the source of the plates for the Rackett edition, the seventh plate having been cut up and the figures distributed as already described. Hence, Rackett's statement on p. 23: "The plates of *Da Costa's British Conchology* have been revised and altered, and six additional ones engraved, to give further illustration to the descriptions."

Since Mr. Reynell's article was written an excellent holograph of Rackett's has been found in the Linnean Society's copy of his edition of Pulteney's Catalogues, establishing the fact that the inscriptions in the copies of Maton & Rackett's "Descriptive Catalogue of British Testacea" are in his handwriting.

B. B. WOODWARD.